

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated July 2, 2004.

In the Office Action, the Patent Office rejected Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,116,835 (Brandon) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereafter "AAPA"). The Patent Office also rejected Claims 6-7; however, only Claims 1-4 are pending in the application. In a telephone conversation between Attorney for Applicant, Austin Victor and Examiner Stephen Choi on November 10, 2004, Examiner Choi stated that the rejection of Claims 6-7 was improper and should be disregarded. Applicant requests notice that the rejection has been withdrawn.

By the present Amendment, Applicant amended Claims 1 and 2. Applicant asserts that the application is now in condition for allowance in view of the amendments to the claims and for the reasons that follow. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Patent Office rejected Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,116,835 (Brandon) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereafter "AAPA"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in view of the amendment to Claim 1 and for the reasons that follow. Claim 1 was amended to define a method of sawing and trimming boards in which the boards are delivered along a path. After the boards are sawn, they are aligned adjacent one side of a conveyor, or adjacent to another side of the conveyor, against lumber lines. These lumber lines are contiguous with the path in which the boards are delivered.

Neither Brandon nor AAPA, taken singly or in combination, teach or suggest lumber lines which are contiguous to a path along which boards are delivered. AAPA does not teach alignment of boards adjacent to separate lumber lines which are contiguous to the path of delivery. The system of Brandon requires boards to be delivered to bins via lumber lines which are non-contiguous to the path in which the boards are initially delivered. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brandon with those of AAPA to achieve Applicant's invention as defined in independent Claim 1.

Claims 2-4 depend from Claim 1. These claims are also believed to be allowable as they further define Applicant's method of sawing and trimming boards. Based upon the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the

application and its early allowance. If any issues remain after consideration of this Amendment, Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone Applicant's attorney to expedite allowance of the same.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

WEYERHAEUSER COMPANY



Austin Victor
Registration No. 47,154
Direct Dial No. 253-924-3839